



OFFICE *of the* ATTORNEY GENERAL
GREG ABBOTT

June 23, 2003

Ms. Kathleen Spears
Officer for Public Information
Parkland Health & Hospital System
5201 Harry Hines Boulevard
Dallas, Texas 75235

OR2003-4272

Dear Ms. Spears:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 183131.

The Dallas County Hospital District d/b/a Parkland Health & Hospital System (the "district") received a request for "Request for Proposals ("RFP") for Core IT Services, Number 4053-03." You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code. Under section 552.110 of the Government Code, the district also believes that the request for information implicates the proprietary interests of interested third parties. In lieu of arguments under section 552.110, you indicate that you notified the third parties of the request for information and of each party's right to submit arguments as to why the requested information should not be released.¹ See Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in Public Information Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

¹The following third parties received notice pursuant to section 552.305: Superior Consultant Holdings Corporation; Affiliated Computer Services, Inc.; Cap Gemini Ernst & Young U.S., L.L.C.; EDS; Perot Systems Healthcare Services, L.L.C.; Computer Sciences Corporation; Provider Healthnet Services, Inc.; and Schlumberger Omnes, Inc.

You assert that the requested information is excepted from disclosure based on section 552.104 of the Government Code. Section 552.104 states that information is excepted from required public disclosure if release of the information would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. The purpose of this exception is to protect the interests of a governmental body usually in competitive bidding situations. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991). This exception protects information from public disclosure if the governmental body demonstrates potential harm to its interests in a particular competitive situation. *See* Open Records Decision No. 463 (1987). Generally, section 552.104 does not except bids from public disclosure after bidding is completed and the contract has been awarded. *See* Open Records Decision No. 541 (1990).

In this case, you inform us that no contract has been awarded in response to RFP 4053-03. You further advise that, although RFP 4053-03 was canceled, the RFP will be re-issued in the near future. You assert that release of the requested information "would create an unfair competitive advantage to the requestor and ultimately harm the competitive bid process as it relates to the future RFP." We therefore conclude that the requested information is excepted from disclosure based on section 552.104 until such time as the contract is awarded. In light of our conclusion under section 552.104, we need not address the other exceptions raised.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one

of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877)673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512)475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/jh

Ref: ID# 183131

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Alfred Campanella
CTG HealthCare Solutions, Inc.
12 First Avenue
Haddon Heights, New Jersey 08035
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bernard J. Breen

c: Computer Sciences Corporation
3170 Fairview Park Drive
Falls Church, Virginia 22042
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Charles M. Young
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Provider Healthnet Services, Inc.
15851 Dallas Parkway, Suite 925
Addison, Texas 75001
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Terrell P. Warnberg
Cap Gemini Ernst & Young U.S., L.L.C.
7701 Las Colinas Ridge, Suite 600
Irving, Texas 75063
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Dianne Ralston
Senior Legal Counsel
Schlumberger
5599 San Felipe, Suite 400
Houston, Texas 77056
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Lyndon F. Bittle
Counsel for Perot Systems Healthcare Services, L.L.C.
200 Crescent Court, Suite 1500
Dallas, Texas 75201-1848
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert J. Garrey
Jackson Walker L.L.P.
901 Main Street, Suite 6000
Dallas, Texas 75202
Attorney for ACS Healthcare Solutions
(w/o enclosures)

c: Mr. Richard P. Saslow
Vice President & General Counsel
Superior Consultant Holdings Corporation
17570 West 12 Mile
Southfield, Michigan 48076
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. William A. Van Blarcum
Legal Affairs
EDS Corporation
5400 Legacy Drive, H3-3A-05
Plano, Texas 75024
(w/o enclosures)